

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated September 7, 2007. Claims 26-65 are currently pending. Claims 26 and 31 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 42-45, 47-49, 51, 58-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909 to Logan et al. ("Logan"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the Logan reference.

Claim 26 recites, in part, "determining that at least one page identified in the rotation set is not stored in a cache associated with the display device." The Office Action states that the Logan reference teaches this feature at column 6, line 36; however, the cited portions of the Logan reference fail to teach at least this feature of the claim. Instead, the Logan reference teaches that when a user touches a displayed link on a kiosk touchscreen, a request is issued and the access mechanism retrieves URLs in the request from remote servers, when a URL is identified as stored on a remote server (Logan, column 6, lines 11-14, 26-36). The Logan reference fails to teach determining that at least one page identified in the rotation set is not stored in a cache associated with the display device. Retrieving a URL from a remote server in response to a user request for the URL, as disclosed by Logan, is not the same as determining if a page identified in a rotation set is not stored in a cache. Thus, the Logan reference fails to teach determining that at least one page identified in a rotation set is not stored in a cache associated with a display device. Accordingly, claim 26 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

In addition, claim 26 recites, in part, "sending, to a remote server, at least one request for the at least one page identified in the rotation set that is not stored in the cache." The Office Action states that the Logan reference teaches these features at column 18, lines 46-58. However, the cited portions of the Logan reference teach that when the display unit is idle, the

display unit uses the idle time to perform housekeeping information transfers (Logan, column 18, lines 37-40). One of these described information transfers includes processing the records in the lookup table, which includes sending an "if modified since message" to the server holding the file and if the file has been modified since the locally stored copy was created or was updated by the display unit, the newly revised copy is accessed and stored (Logan, column 18, lines 47-55). The Logan reference fails to teach sending, to a remote server, at least one request for pages identified in the rotation set that are not stored in the cache. Instead, the Logan reference teaches checking for updates to locally stored files in the lookup table, when the display unit is idle. Any locally stored files with modifications or updates are replaced. Thus, rather than requesting pages not stored in the cache that are identified in a rotation set, the Logan reference teaches determining if there are updates to locally stored files. Accordingly, claim 26 and its corresponding dependent claims are further allowable over the cited art.

Independent claim 42 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 26 discussed above. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 26, claim 42 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 28 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0078134 to Stone et al. ("Stone"). Claims 28 and 46 depend on claims 26 and 42, respectively. For at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claims 26 and 42, the Logan reference does not teach all the features of the claims. The Stone reference fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Logan reference. Accordingly, claims 26 and 42 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 31, 32, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0046299 to Lefeber et al. ("Lefeber") in further view of Logan

and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 to Jeyaraman et al. ("Jeyaraman"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 31 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent claim 26. In particular, claim 31 recites, in part, at least one display device adapted to "determine that at least one page identified in the rotation set is not stored in a cache associated with the display device" and "send, to a remote server, at least one request for the at least one page pages identified in the rotation set that are is not stored in the cache." As stated in the Office Action the Lefebber reference does not teach these features of the claim (Office Action, page 12). In addition, for at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 26, the Logan reference does not teach this feature of the claim. The Jeyaraman reference also fails to rectify the deficiencies of the Lefebber and the Logan references. Accordingly, claim 31 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 33, 34, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyaraman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0084124 to Su et al. ("Su"). Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyarman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2003/0005129 to Sheinkman ("Sheinkman"). Claim 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber, Logan, and Jeyaraman in further view of SearchSecurity.com, pages 1-3, published Oct. 5, 2000 ("SearchSecurity.com"). Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefebber and Jeyaraman in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2004/0039776 to Ballard ("Ballard").

Claims 33-38, 40, and 41 depend on claim 31. For at least the reasons mentioned in conjunction with claim 31, the Lefebber, the Logan, and the Jeyaraman references do not teach all the features of the claim. The Su reference, the Sheinkman reference, the SearchSecurity.com reference, and the Ballard reference fail to rectify the deficiencies of the Lefebber, the Logan, and the Jeyaraman references. Accordingly, claim 31 and its dependent claims 33-38, 40 and 41 are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0016839 to Smith et al. ("Smith"). Claims 52, 53, 55 and 63-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of Lefeber. Claims 56 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan and Ballard in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 to Hanson et al. ("Hanson"). Claims 61 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in further view of Ballard.

Claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 depend on claim 26. For at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 26, the Logan reference does not teach all the features of the claim. In addition, the Smith reference, the Lefeber reference, the Ballard reference, and the Hanson reference fail to rectify the deficiencies of the Logan reference. Accordingly, claim 26 and its dependent claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice. If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

A Request for Continued Examination and a fee authorization for the required fee are being submitted with this reply. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any additional fees or credits due to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 30, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26230

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091